SETH L. SANDERS

From Adapa to Enoch

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
167

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Edited by

Maren Niehoff (Jerusalem)
Annette Y. Reed (Philadelphia, PA)
Seth Schwartz (New York, NY)
Moulie Vidas (Princeton, NJ)

167

Seth L. Sanders

From Adapa to Enoch

Scribal Culture and Religious Vision in Judea and Babylon

Mohr Siebeck

Seth L. Sanders, born 1968; 1999 PhD from Johns Hopkins University; 2007–2013 Assistant Professor of Religion, 2013–2015 Associate Professor at Trinity College; since 2015 Professor of Religious Studies at University of California Davis; 2010–2011 Fellow at NYU Institute for the Study of the Ancient World; 2015–2016 NEH and Guggenheim Fellow.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-154727-0
ISBN 978-3-16-154456-9
ISSN 0721-8753 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

"I therefore assume that most visionaries are either psychotic or shamming, or that they are imitating other visionaries who are psychotic, shamming, or imitating. If this assumption holds, it may be that much recent visionary poetry is written by imitators imitating imitators imitating imitators imitating imitators worshipfully imitating a few originals."
– Joshua Mehigan

ša rību ipušuni šūtu-ma namburbî etapaš
"He who caused the earthquake – he also made the ritual against it."
– Assyrian scholar, SAA 10 56 r 10–12

This book asks what drove the religious visions of ancient scribes. During the first millennium BCE both Babylonian and Judean scribes wrote about and emulated their heroes Adapa and Enoch, who went to heaven to meet god. These sages brought back esoteric secrets uniting knowledge of the divine and physical world – what we would call both mysticism and science – secrets the scribes copied and shared with each other. Where did these journeys come from: cultural borrowing? Raw visionary experience? And what made their knowledge credible: ongoing revelation? Worshipful imitation? It argues that we should treat the creativity of these writers, their cultures of religious vision, as a historical question.

The heavenly journeys and visions described in ancient religious literature have often been analyzed phenomenologically, as mystical experiences. On the model of Paul, "who was caught up to the third heaven – whether in the body or out of the body I do not know; God knows," the mysteries of ancient scribes traveled beyond their original contexts, inspiring speculation and emulation. As a result they were often understood ahistorically, as symbols or primordial forces. But to us the visions of first-millennium Near Eastern scribal culture are historical objects before anything else: we know them exclusively through tablets, figurines, and seals dug up out of the ground, scrolls discovered, copied and translated.

This book takes three avenues to make ancient scribal visions available as historical, material things created by people. First, it treats Mesopotamian and Judean scribal cultures as individual, pragmatic institutions, presenting the textual evidence for how the best-documented visionary figures were used over centuries or millennia. Adapa's journey is documented over a thousand years before Enoch's, yet their revelations share some important aspects. The book

therefore examines the clearest cases of contact between scribal cultures, precisely when and how they came to share key features. Second, it examines the persona of the scribal hero, not as an original visionary lost to history but as a durable ritual role. Rather than an irrecoverable religious experience, it argues that we can recover how an ideal scribal "self" was available to certain people in certain ways: through rituals documented in texts, through ideals depicted in literature, and through institutions that made these roles durable.

Third, it examines what was behind the creation of ancient religious literature by analyzing specific cases where these texts and selves worked together and how they changed over time. It uses these case studies to outline a history of how the world was thought about and how it could be known: what one could call a historical ontology and epistemology of first-millennium scribal cultures.[1] The surprising result is at least as much a history of science as a history of mysticism: insight into the changing ancient visions of the fundamental nature of existence and how it can be known.

I wrote this book to address a big question for which philology has often had more data than answers. In "The Assyrian Tree of Life: Tracing the Origins of Jewish Monotheism and Greek Philosophy" (1993b) the great Assyriologist Simo Parpola threw down the gauntlet for understanding the religious visions of ancient scribes historically. I found the work both dangerously anachronistic and spellbinding when I encountered it in graduate school. Comparing the cosmic trees decorating Neo-Assyrian palace walls with the cosmic trees representing the Godhead in medieval Kabbalah, Parpola argued that Jewish and Mesopotamian thought shared a worldview symbolized in the tree. To achieve this, his reading skipped large gaps in evidence – often 2,000 years long – and found a system of thought nowhere clearly documented in the ancient Near Eastern sources. My own Akkadian teacher, the Sumerologist Jerrold Cooper, pinpointed the article's problematic logic: if a Mesopotamian phenomenon could be interpreted kabbalistically, then that kabbalistic interpretation must be originally Mesopotamian (Cooper 2000:436). Yet Cooper agreed that given their sustained contacts, elements of Mesopotamian religion must live on via Jewish thought. But which parts, how and why? The question is how to understand the interplay of influence and parallel development between two different religions.[2]

But while the critique is more convincing than the narrative, it still cannot replace it: ultimately, we need more well-grounded histories to take the place

[1] For historical ontology, see the book of that name by Hacking 2002, drawing on Foucault 1984 and the tendency in science studies and anthropology to see ontology historically. On the historical epistemology of European natural sciences see Daston 1991, for a history of the modern fact Poovey 1998.

[2] Even the more modest claims of continuity between biblical, apocalyptic, and early mystical literature have been subject to parallel critique (Boustan 2007, Boustan and McCullough 2014, Himmelfarb 2006, Mizrahi 2009, 2011, Schäfer 2009).

of excessively speculative ones. If not unbroken underground continuity, what connections can we plausibly document between Babylonian and Jewish scribal cultures? If not ecstatic heavenly journeys, what can we say about the creative motivations of their scribes? If not an intangible mysticism, how can we understand their worldviews? These are fundamental questions for the history of culture and the study of religion. My dissertation (1999) was my first attempt to put some of these pieces together, but I still found it immensely difficult to put such diverse data in concrete, plausible context. Over 150 years of Near Eastern textual discovery have given us more evidence than we know how to think about.

This book attacks its big question slowly and from multiple angles. Rather than forcing the wide range of relevant evidence into a single framework, it narrates two parallel histories, and then documents where and how they intertwined. To do this it takes lessons from a variety of successful approaches to the questions of contact and change in first-millennium Near Eastern scribal cultures. Scholars of Second Temple Judaism such as Michael Stone, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Annette Reed showed me that richly illuminating a theme such as astronomy or science in one historical context opens up three-dimensional connections to others. Assyriological work such as that of Paul-Alain Beaulieu, Michael Jursa, Eleanor Robson, and Caroline Waerzeggers cast light on the material basis of heavenly visions, revealing the locations, libraries, and sometimes the names and personal contacts of scribes working between cuneiform and Aramaic, Babylon and Judea.

Early contact with linguistic anthropologists like Robin Shoaps and Michael Silverstein attuned me to the different sorts of subjectivity that ancient scribes might have participated in through their texts and rituals. It was immensely helpful to draw on historians and theorists of the speaking subject from Marcel Mauss and Émile Benveniste to Erving Goffman and Judith Butler. To complete the book, I realized it was important to expand beyond the individual to the different concepts of reality implied in the texts such that, for example, neither Mesopotamian nor Priestly literature had a concept of "nature" separate from either the supernatural or from culture. Such different subjects must have lived in different worlds – and the study of the contrast between these worlds is a discipline which the philosopher Ian Hacking (2002), borrowing a term from Michel Foucault (1984), called "historical ontology." Here I was delighted to find that scholars of Mesopotamian (Rochberg 2014) and Jewish (Wolfson 2005) thought had already written immensely useful chapters in Babylonian and Jewish historical ontology, from the complementary viewpoints of the history of science and of mysticism.

Acknowledgements

This book had two phases. The first was when I discovered a treasure trove of data and a set of questions that had not been asked of it, resulting in my 1999 Johns Hopkins dissertation. Kyle McCarter and Delbert Hillers taught me the philological skills to read Hebrew, Aramaic, and epigraphic data in context, and Jerrold Cooper showed me how to ask cuneiform texts your own questions, armed with a sense of history and of humor. My fellow students Doug Emery, Tawny Holm, Phillip Jones, Christopher Rollston, and Gonzalo Rubio shared an atmosphere of both rigor and generosity. This was embodied in the stark, simple kindness of the eminent legal historian Prof. Ray Westbrook *z"l* attending all of our presentations after we graduated. At Brandeis University, Tzvi Abusch opened up the poetics of incantations for me as I checked cuneiform tablets for his critical edition of Maqlû.

Emblematically, the dissertation arose from a chance discussion while crossing a bridge in Chicago with the Israeli Assyriologist Wayne Horowitz. I met Wayne at Hebrew University, where Elnatan Weissert taught us to read Assyrian texts from within, and Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra encouraged me in seeing the shared cuneiform and alphabetic worlds of Second Temple scribes as an important frontier of early Judaism. At the Albright Institute Sy Gitin provided a welcoming East Jerusalem shelter for scholars from Israel, Palestine, and the rest of the world, and the economic historian Péter Vargyas gave me Piccioni's rare Italian book, published in Hungary, from which I learned almost everything I knew about Adapa. I first came to Jerusalem to study with the great – and hilarious – Aramaist Jonas Greenfield *z"l*; he and his friend Michael Stone are the ones who inducted me into a larger and richer ancient world than I could have imagined.

The second phase began when I realized that scholars working over a decade had made a series of independent advances on the dissertation's key problems. Alan Lenzi's comparative history of scribal secrecy, Jonathan Ben-Dov's precise account of how Jewish scholarship adapted Babylonian astronomy, and Annette Reed's placement of apocalyptic knowledge in the history of science illuminated how ancient scholarship was shared without being homogenous. David Carr and Karel van der Toorn made ancient Near Eastern scribal culture a topic of study in its own right by arguing that literatures be seen primarily through the lens of their producers. And Assyriological work on Late Babylonian archives and scribes placed them in worlds of converging cuneiform and Aramaic culture. These advances came together for me in 2010–11 at the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, where discussions with Mathieu Ossendrijver, Alexander Jones, and Ben-Dov made the intellectual ferment of the first millennium BCE real to me, and let us mark the Jewish area out as an area of study (Ben-Dov and Sanders 2014, cf. Gabbay and Secunda 2014). Back home, a workshop at

the Trinity Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies helped me refine the emerging results (including the entirely new chapters 3, 4, and 5) as both social theory and Semitic Philology, and inspiring critique from Ra'anan Boustan and Jeff Cooley showed me how this could really work. All of these fellow scholars' insight and generosity helped me see the coherent ancient reality behind what had been a tantalizing web of connections, and made this book possible. The talent and curiosity of students and younger colleagues, including Jessie DeGrado, Alix De Gramont, Charles Huff, Dan Pioske, and Al Salvato, are the clearest evidence of the point of the enterprise – but without Charles' copyediting it would have been a nearly illegible one.

Between the first and second phases of the book was quite literally a journey, from Baltimore and Jerusalem to Chicago, Ithaca, and finally New England. My only constant in it was my Canaan dog mix Lee, discovered as a puppy in a basket in Ain Kerem during the first snow of 2000 and given into my care by Sergio La Porta. She was my tireless shadow on wooded runs stretching up to four hours where I would only stop to take notes on ancient ritual or let her drink from streams. Her long life, spent so often outdoors or on the road like mine, was completed shortly before the book was.

The turning point between this project's primeval origins and final form was a conversation with Eva Mroczek which turned into something more vivid and unpredictable than a commentary. In a profound way this book – like me – is inspired and informed by what she does, just one part of a dialogue with her that goes far beyond its pages.

I dedicate this book to the memory of Tim Aher, whose wonder at the remotest corners of the universe and joy in making the most difficult realms of culture reveal their secrets is its real theme.

Contents

Preface V
Acknowledgements VIII

Introduction 1

I. Two Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Scribal Cultures and their Heroes 3
1. Studies of Scribal Cultures and Techniques 3
2. Heavenly Sages and the History-of-Traditions Approach 10
3. Heavenly Sages in the Twenty-First Century: Towards Scribal Cultures in Historical Context 20

II. Ideologies of Continuity and Reinvention 21
1. Overview of the Book's Arguments 24

Chapter 1: Heavenly Sages and the Mesopotamian Scribal Ideology of Continuity 27

I. The Ascents of Kings 28
1. The Figure of Etana 28
2. The Ascent of the King in the Ur III and Isin Periods (c. twenty-first century BCE) 35

II. The Ascent of the God Dumuzi 37

III. The Ascent of the Sage 38
1. The Figure of Adapa 38
2. The Earliest Rituals and Myths about Adapa (Old Babylonian Period c. 1800–1600 BCE) 39
3. The Myth of Adapa and the South Wind 41
4. The Use of Adapa by First-Millennium Kings 44
5. Adapa in Catalogues and Letters 50
6. Adapa in Incantations 51
7. Adapa in Scholarly Lists: Scribal Accounts of History, Geography, and the Divine Realm 57
8. Adapa in Myth 61

IV. A History of Adapa and the *Apkallū* 66
V. Conclusion 68

Chapter 2: "I Am Adapa!" The Divine Personae of Mesopotamian Scribes 71

I. Identification with Adapa and the *Apkallū* in Written Ritual 72
II. Our Problem with Presence 75
III. An Ancient Mesopotamian Ontology 78
IV. Persona: The Authenticity of the Exorcist's Ritual Mask 83
V. How the Diviner Meets the Gods 89
1. The King as Diviner, the Diviner as King 94
2. The Location and Accessibility of the Divine Assembly 95
VI. Shared Cosmic Roles and Locations in Mesopotamian Ritual 97
VII. Conclusion 98

Chapter 3: Ezekiel's Hand of the Lord: Judahite Scribal Reinventions of Heavenly Vision 103

I. Prophetic Vision as Language 104
II. Throne Visions and Problems of Knowledge 107
III. Ezekiel's Word of the Lord: Writing as the Reader's Loss of Prophetic Experience 111
IV. The Hand of the Lord: A Scribal Pragmatics of Divine Action 117
V. The Word of the Lord is Not Enough: From Experience to Measurement 122
VI. Conclusion 126

Chapter 4: Enoch's Knowledge and the Rise of Apocalyptic Science . . 129

I. "Apocalyptic Science"? The Novelty of Ancient Judean Exact Knowledge 130
II. The Roots of Early Jewish Science in Priestly Categories and Language 138
III. How Enoch Knew: The Creation of New Scientific Genres in Second Temple Judaism 142
IV. Conclusion: Gaining Enoch's Knowledge 149

Chapter Five: Aramaic Scholarship and Cultural Transmission: From Public Power to Secret Knowledge 153

I. Mesopotamian and Jewish Literatures Versus Babylonian and Aramaic Scribal Cultures 153

II. What Was Aramaic and Who Were Aramaic Scribes? 154

III. The Initial Pattern: Empirical Evidence for the West Semitic Adaptation of Mesopotamian Texts in Judah 156

1. From Public Power to Secret Knowledge 158
2. The Attitudes of Aramaic Scribes toward Their Material and Structural Parallels with the Attitudes of Mesopotamian Scribes 159
3. An Example of an Uncertain Case of Aramaic Scribes' Transformation of Inherited Material 161

IV. The Broader Picture: Known Transformations of Mesopotamian Genres into West Semitic 162

1. Method 163
   a. The Late Bronze Age: Direct Contact and Influence in an Ugaritic Vassal Tribute Agreement Modeled on Akkadian 166
   b. The Ninth Century BCE: Direct Contact and Mutual Influence in an Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual from Anatolia 167
   c. Tenth–Eighth Centuries BCE: A Shared Discourse Between Luwian, Akkadian, and Phoenician Monuments for Aramean Kings in Anatolia 169
   d. Eight–Seventh Centuries BCE: Direct Contact and Restricted Aramaic Influence in Oath Rituals in Assyria, Syria, Anatolia and Judah 171
   e. Cuneiform Legal Discourse in Biblical Law: The Covenant Code . . . 179
   f. The Assur Ostracon and the Aramaic Legal Tablets: Akkadian Influence and One-to-One Translation Techniques During the Neo-Assyrian Period 181
   g. Persian Period: The Fifth-Century BCE Copy of the Behistun Inscription at Elephantine 183
   h. Persian Period: The Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine and Wadi ed-Daliyeh 186
   i. Aramaic Scholarship in Apocalyptic Literature: Astronomical Enoch and Aramaic Levi in the Hellenistic Period 188

V. The Means of Transmission 188

VI. Conclusion: The Nature of Aramaic Scribal Culture 195

Chapter 6: "Who is Like Me Among the Angels?" Judean Reinventions of the Scribal Persona 197

Introduction: Was Religious Experience an Ancient Judean Problem? 197

I. Discourse Versus Presence: A Modern Scholarly Dichotomy 200

II. Created and Commanded: An Ancient Judean Ontology 205

III. A Mask of Light 207

1. "We are Turned into the Image We Reflect:" The Reflexive Role of Enlightened One 212

IV. Lucifer's Ascent to Heaven 214
V. Being Reckoned Divine 218
VI. Bodies of Light: A Hellenistic Jewish Scribal Worldview 221
VII. Conclusion 224

Conclusion 227

I. From Adapa to Enoch 228
II. The Relationship Between Babylonian and Judean Scribal Cultures 229
1. From Instruments of Rule to Rules of the Universe 229
2. The Parchment Period 231
III. Scribal Metaphysics and the Creation of Revealed Literature 233
1. From Religious Experience to Apocalyptic Science 233
2. Writing and Revelation Before the Supernatural 235

Bibliography 237
General Index 271

Introduction

The oldest preserved biblical manuscripts, found in the scholarly collections of the Dead Sea Scrolls, date from around 200 BCE. But they often speak a language and refer to events that we only know to have been current some four centuries or more earlier, in the late Iron Age. We have little direct evidence for what happened in between. The cross-section of Judean intellectual culture reflected in the Scrolls was different in key ways from the Iron Age one that many biblical texts portray. For example, we find entire new genres like biblical commentaries, the first Jewish texts dedicated exclusively to other texts. And while Deuteronomy forbids the study of the stars, in the Scrolls we find not only the earliest Jewish science, an astronomical treatise in Aramaic ascribed to a biblical figure, but also the earliest full-blown apocalyptic heavenly journey. In fact we find both in the same text. In the *Astronomical Book*, the patriarch Enoch is taken through the cosmos to learn the exact formulae for its movements, making it the first Jewish text tying together heavenly journeys and scholarly knowledge.[1]

Was this early Jewish intellectual culture a radical break from the earlier scribal worlds of Judah and of the rest of the ancient Near East? Are there empirical ways to track the changes in how writers thought and worked between the Iron Age and Hellenistic period? This fundamental historical question about the Bible and early Jewish literature is one for which we seem to have the least solid data. A single fact highlights the problem and an avenue of investigation. Each new kind of genre or knowledge mentioned above – exegetical commentaries, astronomical science, and a sage's heavenly journey – is known in Mesopotamia at least 500 years before it is found in Judea. Striking shared elements appear under very different historical circumstances. If these changes are part of a shared development in the intellectual life of the region, shifts in a common ancient Near Eastern scribal culture, why do they only appear in Judea so much later, under the new conditions of Hellenism?[2] Ancient Near Eastern scribal culture

[1] On the nature and limits of the category of Jewish science see Ben-Dov and Sanders 2014 and Reed 2014, building on the work of Reed 2007, Alexander 2002, and Ruderman 1995. *Astronomical Enoch* predates the scrolls by at least a century, but it was repeatedly used at Qumran, as the multitude of manuscripts attest, and, as Ben-Dov has demonstrated, it was influential in the scientific thinking of the Qumran community.

[2] In what is still the most influential theory, the historian of religion Jonathan Z. Smith (1978: 67–87) argued for a uniform explanation: the universal loss of Near Eastern native kingship in the Persian period triggered a shift from a this-worldly "locative" focus to an otherworldly

spans more than 3,000 years, far-flung cities and empires, and many languages and writing systems. The risk of examining it as a whole is there may not *be* a whole – at least, we will be better able to tell once we have seen it intimately, at specific moments, in particular forms.

We need a way to place these scribal cultures in history – narrow enough to track in a single focused study, but revealing enough to suggest key similarities and differences. We find a unique angle on this problem in the figure of the sage and the genre of the heavenly journey because its protagonist is an ideal type, a key element of scribes' identification and self-representation. The heavenly journey traces revealingly different trajectories in each culture as the protagonists and goals change.[3] The mythic sages Adapa and Enoch each emerge as patron saints of their respective scribal cultures – Adapa in Mesopotamia by the Neo-Assyrian period and Enoch in Judea by the Hellenistic period. In a pattern shared by both these Semitic-speaking scholarly groups, an expert in texts and rituals journeys to heaven to gain a transformed status and new knowledge. Scholars in both cultures ritually identify with this figure: in Babylonian literally, as incantations proclaim "I am Adapa!", and at Qumran implicitly, as sectarians claim to have Enoch's forms of knowledge revealed to them. In both cultures this sage also undergoes significant shifts over time in his own nature and the knowledge gained. The changes in his role are an index of the transformation of the scribal cultures themselves.

Adapa in Mesopotamia and Enoch in Judea share central features of scribal heroes that let us also examine key areas of difference: the main social role of the scribal hero, how they make and transmit texts, and the nature of their role as mediators between the human and divine realms. They are both experts in divine texts and rituals and gain their knowledge at the source. By itself, this could be reduced to self-legitimation – the exclusive claim to control God's own texts, texts which modern historians understand as human. But this does not explain why they believed it, or how they lived it out. Part of the promise of ancient scholarship was identification with the great sages, who brought them the wonders of knowledge. Scholars ritually identified with them in Mesopotamia using techniques such as the verbal claim to be Adapa and the representation of ritualists as semidivine sages in art. In Judea, the claims to divine knowledge were enacted in central Qumran rituals like the *Hodayot* and *Songs of the Sabbath*

"utopian" one. The theory has great explanatory power but has rarely been tested against a more concrete cultural history like the one this study attempts.

[3] While Adapa had been an important ritual figure for a thousand years before he emerged as dominant, the role of protagonist in the heavenly journey remained open in Judea. In earlier texts, different prophets received brief audiences before the heavenly throne; during the exile Ezekiel had a new type of journey marking a watershed in the scribal imagery of divine knowledge and religious experience. By the Hellenistic period, Enoch emerged as the central figure of identification, bearing new types of knowledge.

Sacrifice and the structuring of daily life around Enochic knowledge through calendrical and scientific texts.

Instead of assuming an essentially uniform ancient Near Eastern scribal culture shared across regions and millennia, we can compare specific scribal cultures with respect to an issue of vital interest to the scribes themselves. How was the scholarship of Judea distinctive with respect to the rest of the ancient Near East – for example, Mesopotamia – and *vice-versa*? Studying the transformation of the scribal hero's heavenly journey in Mesopotamia and Judah lets us locate these major cultural changes historically and humanly – in interactions between real people, through specific languages and media, under particular social circumstances.

The proposal of this book is to place the scribal cultures of Babylonia and Judea in dialogue. Rather than assuming essential similarity or difference, it explores each through its history, its distinctive assumptions about the world, and the roles that these worldviews gave its scribes to play. The distinctive media technologies and political histories of each resulted in two distinctive pattterns: a Babylonian scribal culture of continuity and a Judean scribal culture of reinvention. Equally creative, the two shared profound historical changes and by the Persian period shared a dominant Aramaic culture in which both participated. Seeing one in light of the other can better illuminate the distinctive qualities of each and help pinpoint the most meaningful cases of contact and change.

I. Two Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Scribal Cultures and their Heroes

The scribes of Judea and Mesopotamia and their ways of making texts have been approached in two basic ways: through broad comparative studies of scribal cultures and editing techniques or through narrower history-of-traditions studies of the heavenly journey that attempt to demonstrate influence, always of Mesopotamian on Jewish culture, and examine the scribes' mythical role models, central to their imaginative and practical worlds. The following section reflects on a set of key works: the vistas they have opened, their limits, and how this book is designed to build on them.

1. Studies of Scribal Cultures and Techniques

The detailed comparative study of Judean and ancient Near Eastern scribal culture in the twenty-first century was initiated by David Carr's monumental *Writing on the Tablets of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (2005), which raised essential questions about what ancient scholarship was and pro-

posed concrete answers for debate. His study was motivated by a sense that the standard scholarly image of the Pentateuch's creation – cutting and pasting by transcribing different sources from multiple scrolls – may be anachronistic, imposing assumptions from other times and places on ancient Judah (2005:1). The question is crucial, and the problem has long been that we have no direct evidence to confirm or deny this image because virtually no extended Hebrew literary manuscripts have survived from before 200 BCE. To fill in this gap in data, Carr goes to a wide variety of ancient societies, painting an overall picture of how texts were "produced, collected, revised, and used" in the ancient Near East and Mediterranean – primarily Mesopotamia, Egypt, Israel, and Greece, but also including e. g. Ugarit, Rome, and early Rabbinic society – from approximately 3000 BCE to 200 CE. The danger would be in replacing one anachronism with another one: Old Babylonian-era Sumerian education, which features prominently in the study, is as remote in time from early Jewish education as early Judaism is from our own, and its logo-syllabic writing system operated on different principles from the alphabetic system that Hebrew and English both inherit.

Carr's book tends to portray ancient Near Eastern scribal cultures as a single type of system with one main goal: indoctrination.

> What was primary was not how such texts were inscribed on clay, parchment or papyri. Rather, what was truly crucial was how those written media were part of a cultural project of incising key cultural-religious traditions – word for word – on people's minds (2005:8).

Both alphabetic and cuneiform scribal culture from Byblos to Babylon "use[d] written texts as part of a larger educational project of ensuring stable transmission of key traditions across time" (2005:8, 9). People were programmed like computers, and the texts were used "to transfer the software – key cultural traditions – from one generation of scribal administrators and elite leaders to another" (2005:9).

As an insight into how education can reinforce social structures, Carr's point is important[4] – but it cannot account for all ancient Near Eastern data he analyzes. This includes cases he considers crucial, such as the thirteenth-century Syrian city-state of Ugarit, the best-documented case of alphabetic writing in the pre-Hellenistic Near East. Carr emphasizes Ugarit because it is "the main example of the occurence of the Sumero-Akkadian scribal matrix *alongside a parallel and analogous system of alphabetic education* … Ugarit is unique in providing an example of a culture, relatively close to Israel geographically and chronologically, that developed an alphabetic educational system along lines

[4] This theory was applied to Mesopotamian bureaucracy by Michalowski (1987) and strikingly paralleled by the important analysis of modern education as an ideological state apparatus by Althusser (1994 [1970]), who would make a fascinating dialogue partner for Carr's arguments.

similar to the Sumero-Akkadian cuneiform system that had dominated education in the area up to that point" (2005:55–56).

This picture of education in Ugaritic writing is important for his overall project of applying data from large-scale societies like Babylon with one media form (cuneiform) to far smaller ones with different media like Judah (the linear alphabet). He contrasts his approach to an opposing claim, that "Israel would not have had an educational system like that of ancient Mesopotamia because its simpler alphabet did not require such an extensive educational process" (2005:55–56). But the argument is a straw man because the two issues are not necessarily related: learning to write literary texts in an alphabet demonstrably required extensive education (Rollston 2006), but this does not tell us whether Levantine alphabetic education can safely be assumed to be like Mesopotamian cuneiform education.

The claim that Ugaritic alphabetic and Sumero-Akkadian education were fundamentally similar is based on a series of textual examples drawn from secondary sources:[5] scribes were trained to write Ugaritic through alphabets, name lists, grammar exercises, literary excerpts, and god lists before learning standard literary texts including magical texts, a wisdom instruction, and epics such as the poem to Aqhat.[6] But of the eight types of educational text Carr names, from simplest to most complex, there are no certain examples of any but the first, which suggests a very different picture. While alphabetic exercise tablets are relatively frequent, the texts that some scholars have proposed to be educational name lists, grammatical exercises, and literary excerpts are disputed because no example appears more than once and each may also be easily explained as an administrative record or literary variant.[7]

More importantly, there is no evidence that any Ugaritic literary texts were treated in any way as "standard" or curricular. First, each of the major epics appears in only one unique, finely executed copy (as opposed to certain important ritual texts which appear in multiple versions and findspots), and external allusions to these texts are very rare. In contrast to Mesopotamian literary texts, which typically record the source text they were copied from, no Ugaritic literary text mentions a previous written source.[8] Second, when evidence exists about

[5] Carr 2005:54. This section cites no editions or textual data, instead relying on two older surveys, Rainey 1969 and Mack-Fisher 1990, and some incidental comments in a study of the Akkadian of Ugarit (Van Soldt 1991).

[6] Carr repeats this assertion about the standard nature of the Kirtu epic (2005:56): "Scribes at Ugarit learned standard Ugaritic texts like the Kirtu epic, while some learned standard Akkadian texts like the Atrahasis creation and flood epic as well."

[7] For a maximalist attempt at interpreting Ugaritic texts as educational see the study of Hawley 2008 and contrast the statements of Pardee (2002, below).

[8] As Pardee has shown, this is also true of the ritual texts, which show no signs of being archival or scholarly. Rather, in every case where there is evidence, they appear to have been written down *ad hoc* for particular occasions and "none of the tablets that have come down to us bears

their writers, we find they were not copied by students but by senior scribes in positions of authority.[9] There is no clear evidence that Ugaritic literature was used to teach students.

The sharply different patterns of evidence for Ugaritic alphabetic and Sumero-Akkadian education is not plausibly due to accidents of discovery because there are thousands of examples,[10] especially if, as Carr claims, "a smaller number of scribes probably engaged in [Sumero-Akkadian writing] than [Ugaritic]" (2005:56). Carr concludes that "[a]lphabetic education at Ugarit … used similar means to its Mesopotamian counterpart and was directed at similar broad ends: both training in the techniques and textual templates of the scribal tradition and socialization into the – now specifically Ugaritic – scribal office" (2005:56). But as we have seen, this is inaccurate. There is a substantial amount of evidence available showing that Ugaritic scribes learned to write in the Sumero-Akkadian system and then adapted their skills to the alphabet by copying abecedaries and perhaps a few other exercises. The two educational systems were not parallel. Instead, the alphabetic system piggybacked on top of the logo-syllabic one.

This issue suggests some of the difficulties with generalizing scribal culture: in the one case of alphabetic education for which the documentation is abundant, the alphabetic system appears to have been very different from the Sumero-Akkadian one. And the two systems existed not only in the same place and period, but they were often used by precisely the same people. If education varied even within a single scribal culture, this means we cannot assume the fundamental similarity of educational systems between different ancient Near Eastern cultures.

Soon after Carr's study, a differently focused approach appeared by the scholar of Bible and Assyriology Karel van der Toorn. Van der Toorn begins with the same assumption as Carr, that because of the broadly shared scribal culture of

---

a 'canonical' text from a priestly 'library.' If that be the case, the ritual cycle at Ugarit would have been a matter of oral tradition, and the tablets that have been discovered to date would have been dictated as an outline for an upcoming rite or sequence of rites" (2002:57, cf. 2–3).

[9] Compare the statement of van Soldt that the literary texts are shown to be school texts "from the colophons at the end of the tablet, in which the scribe identifies himself as a student" (2010:350), which is based on a dubious understanding of the word for "student" (*lmd*) in one text. In fact, of the literary narratives collected in Parker 1997, the only one where a colophon names the scribe as a "student," the Baal epic KTU 1.6 vi: 53–57, states that it was written by "the scribe Ilimilku the Subbanite, disciple/student (*lmd*) of Attanu-purulini, (who is) chief of the priests (and) chief of the cultic herdsmen; Ta'yu official of Niqmaddu, (who is) king of Ugarit, lord (of) YRGB, (and) master (of) TRMN." While the grammar is not explicit enough to know from this colophon alone which titles apply to Ilimilku and which to his masters, there is abundant external evidence that Ilimilku himself served as a Ta'yu and high official, so that his status as a master scribe is not in doubt. Further, as numerous epigraphers have noted, the actual writing of the tablets of the Baal cycle is of extremely high quality (see Mark Smith 1994 for photographs, epigraphic analysis, and bibliography).

[10] For Ugaritic, some fifty mythological texts and 1,500 prose texts (Bordreuil and Pardee 2009:9).

the ancient Near East, patterns found in Egypt and Mesopotamia often apply to Judah (2007:4). But in contrast to Carr's broad exploration of education across the entire ancient world, from early Sumerian to Egyptian, Classical Greek, and early Jewish and Christian literature, van der Toorn concentrated on the elite production of literary texts in Mesopotamia and Israel.

However, when it comes to the biblical texts van der Toorn has a similar difficulty as Carr: the lack of direct documentation for Hebrew literature before about 200 BCE. As a result, when he makes particular claims about the making of the Hebrew Bible, van der Toorn must sometimes resort to more conjecture than Carr. For example, in chapter 6 he postulates precisely four editions of Deuteronomy between 620 and 500, based on the assumption that a single papyrus "master copy" would have worn out every 30 years and require a single new copy to be created.[11] Each time a fresh manuscript was required, the temple scribes took the opportunity to make a comprehensive and politically pointed new edition. But there are both literary and archaeological problems with this conjecture: on a purely literary basis, many scholars have found signs that the editing of Deuteronomy was more complex than four unified editions.[12] And materially, a shift had begun by the sixth century from writing on papyrus to the more durable medium of parchment, meaning that there is little basis for the thirty-year figure – let alone the larger process van der Toorn assumes (Haran 1982, 1983).

Van der Toorn makes a valuable proposal about a large-scale conceptual shift in Mesopotamian and Judahite scribal self-images. He claims that by a certain point in the Neo-Assyrian period, Mesopotamian and perhaps Judahite scribes stopped viewing themselves as masters of a shifting, essentially oral tradition and started seeing themselves more as caretakers of fixed and essentially written, divinely revealed texts. The extensive production of commentaries in the Neo-Assyrian period and their relationship to the royal control of knowledge has already been remarked by scholars such as Frahm.[13] van der Toorn's thesis crystallizes and draws out this insight, but it requires more fine-grained study to be placed firmly in history.

Van der Toorn's large-scale theory is not always well founded in the Assyriological data. As evidence for a new, first-millennium ideology of the otherworldly sources of texts, he cites two myths: those of the antediluvian king

[11] In a valuable if polemical review, van Seters (2008) points out that though van der Toorn is explicit about borrowing this thesis from Pfeiffer 1941, Pfeiffer allows far more time for the development of Deuteronomy, extending from 621 to ca. 400 BCE – another suggestion of the arbitrariness of the model.

[12] For an exemplary scholarly treatment demonstrative of this complexity, see the three studies presented in Rofé 2002:1–36.

[13] Frahm 1997, esp. 280; for evidence and discussion see chapter 2 below.

Enmeduranki (which we will examine below) and of the semidivine sage Adapa. He summarizes the Akkadian versions of the Adapa myth thus:

> The Old Babylonian version of his myth tells about his breaking the wing of the South Wind; his trial in heaven by Anu; and his return to earth without the gift of immortality. The Neo-Assyrian version, dating to ca. 750 B. C. E., has added a summary that serves to introduce an exorcistic procedure. It repeats that Adapa went up to heaven and saw all its secrets; though still a human being, he thus gained divine knowledge. Adapa's heavenly knowledge is invoked, in the Neo-Assyrian version, as a means to cure disease. His wisdom is no ordinary wisdom; it has its source in heaven (2007:210).

But the progress from short to long with the addition of a discussion of the heavenly source of Adapa's knowledge did not occur. The short version of the myth is actually not the oldest, but dates from the fourteenth century BCE (Izre'el 2001). The problem here is that there *is* an earlier, Old Babylonian-era version – but it is actually the longest known version and already includes just the sort of exorcistic incantation which van der Toorn claims to be a key sign of the new first-millennium idea of authorship![14] And as we shall see in chapter 1, Adapa is also already involved by the Old Babylonian period in exorcistic incantations where the text of the spell is claimed to be transmitted verbatim from a conversation with Enki, the god of magic, in his subterranean realm. This suggests that something like van der Toorn's idea of verbatim textual revelation may have existed a thousand years before he claims it arose. Such large-scale claims about the nature and history of scribal cultures must proceed from nuanced treatments of the primary sources in context.

The promise of Carr and van der Toorn's shared project is demonstrated by the first extended study of a single shared scribal technique in Judahite and Mesopotamian culture. Sara Milstein's 2010 dissertation *Reworking Ancient Texts: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature* is the most detailed and concrete examination of a shared technique between two ancient Near Eastern scribal cultures.[15] She focuses on how scribes revised narratives by adding introductions, giving the story a new beginning and context and encouraging the whole text to be read differently without necessarily altering the body. The work adds to the empirical basis for understanding of literary creativity in

[14] Van der Toorn does not mention Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi 1993, decisively important for any study of the development of the Adapa narrative, despite the fact that it is discussed in Izre'el's 2001 edition of the Adapa texts (he does not draw on Picchioni's more complete – if far less linguistically and poetically rich – 1981 edition of all sources relating to Adapa). For the text itself see now Cavigneaux 2014.

[15] Milstein 2010. Similar comparative studies had been done in briefer form: Tigay (1985) on the combination of sources in Gilgamesh and the Pentateuch, Fishbane on the colophon (1980) and exegetical technique (1977), and Tertel (1994) on editing biblical and Assyrian narrative. But none performed the comparison in as much depth, and Fishbane's comparative study of exegesis actually reveals the absence of several ancient Near Eastern techniques from biblical literature, which interestingly do emerge at Qumran.

these two cultures: by looking at "how scribes *actually operated*, we can provide a check on our efforts to draw conclusions about how specific texts were revised over time" (2010:4). The advantage of revision through introduction is that it is "one of the most *trackable* techniques in the scribal repertoire" (2010:19). She points out that the problem of ambiguous data is really on the biblical side, not the Mesopotamian: "The numerous competing hypotheses for the evolution of nearly every text or book in the Bible" point to the lack of hard data and the need for conjectural reconstruction. By contrast, "[a]bundant evidence of this technique is attested … in the hard data of Mesopotamian literature" (2010:19).

But each of the four Mesopotamian narrative cases turns out to require significant reconstruction. Milstein finds abundant examples of revision by introduction, and classifies them in a useful typology. Yet there is limited empirical evidence of a straightforward process of growth, with an early base text and then later texts with added introductions. In each of her cases the situation is more complex, so in each case the scholar must reconstruct such a process, sometimes reversing or modifying the direction suggested by the manuscript evidence. In two of four Mesopotamian narrative examples – the stories of Etana and Adapa – she must assume that a copy of a text found centuries later represents an earlier stage than one found centuries earlier (2010:38). The other two also rely on complex assumptions – in the case of the later stages of Gilgamesh (Middle and Standard Babylonian, 2010:91–98), she argues that a single unusual manuscript is actually a deliberate and subtle reworking rather than a garbled student copy, as George (2007) argued. Similarly, her arguments about Old Babylonian Gilgamesh require a hypothetical reconstruction of its textual prehistory.

Milstein powerfully applies techniques from the study of biblical literature to recover from the Mesopotamian texts the missing data they were supposed to supply; the results are often convincing, but lose some of the advantage of the Assyriological archive – direct evidence. Treating the Mesopotamian material with the techniques of biblical criticism, she hypothesizes Mesopotamian *Vorlagen* and prototexts. These reconstructions are masterfully done, but much like the uncertain biblical examples, there is no way to be sure. The promised hard data turns out to itself involve reconstruction. The treatments of Etana and Adapa are convincing in many ways and exemplify the advantages of this technique. But Milstein rightly points out that the abundance of cuneiform texts preserved across time should allow us to base our view of scribal culture on direct empirical evidence. In applying the fixed techniques – rather than the broader theoretical questions – of biblical studies to cuneiform texts, we may risk losing the distinctive value of the Mesopotamian evidence.

Milstein's strongest cases of revision through introduction demonstrate a valuable comparative point: Judahite scribes tended to revise more boldly than Mesopotamian ones. In her typology of kinds of revision, the least intrusive certain examples are all Mesopotamian while the most intrusive likely examples

are all biblical (2010:305–309). In other words, when Mesopotamian scribes revised through introduction, they altered their sources less than Judahite scribes. What we see here, then, is one scribal culture that tends towards continuity while another tends towards more intense reinvention.

These three major comparative studies of Judahite and Mesopotamian scribal culture each represent foundational steps forward but all share a limit. None capitalize on the most obvious advantages of the cuneiform record: the dated evidence it provides not only for how literary texts were edited but for what their editors and users thought about their material, evidence for how they were used and what they meant to people.

2. Heavenly Sages and the History-of-Traditions Approach

But what counts as evidence for the history of a scribal culture's mythic heroes and their adventures? When it came to comparing Judean and other Near Eastern scribal cultures we have seen scholars take a broad typological approach, often bringing together features from disparate cultures with limited regard for the feature's historical context and meaning within its source culture.

A line from Helge Kvanvig's introduction to his massive study on the Mesopotamian roots of Judean apocalyptic heavenly journeys exemplifies the attitude that prevailed in twentieth-century scholarship. In this history-of-tradition approach we can see significant parallels[16] with the way scribal cultures have been compared *in toto*:

> The research history of apocalyptic is … not the history [of] how new methods have been applied to the same texts, but the history of an ongoing expansion of relevant sources (1988:3).

The picture is of an increasing pool of raw data, and the sort of evidence Kvanvig describes as relevant is the type that Carr and van der Toorn apply to Israel – the abundant but disparate remains of Mesopotamian scribalism.

We will now explore how Near Eastern evidence has been used to write the history of the most prominent new hero of Judean scribal culture, Enoch, in light of how scribal cultures as wholes have been compared. Scholars tended to compare parallel "traditions" between cultures assuming that if a given element was present at any point in the static source culture, it could serve as an influence on the dynamic target culture, Judaism. The result tended to be a view of Near Eastern culture as an unchanging collection of frozen traditions that could

[16] Though as we will see, the history of traditions approach sometimes inverts the pan-Near-Eastern-scribalism approach: rather than assuming, where data is lacking, that Judah can be expected to share Mesopotamian patterns, attested shared patterns between Judea and Mesopotamia are interpreted as the result of historical derivation from Mesopotamia.

be applied to a developing Judaism. It is important to disentangle this modern scholarly view from the ancient evidence, because the modern view tends to accept and perpetuate an ancient scribal self-image that is largely mythological. Cuneiform culture claimed to transmit timeless revelations "from before the flood" and Judean scribes emphasized destruction and reinvention, the renewal of revelation after radical historical breaks. This means we must be wary of assuming (as even valuable critical theories such as van der Toorn's does) that first-millennium Mesopotamian scribal culture underwent few crucial changes, or that Judean scribal culture was dynamic in a way that Babylonian culture was not.

In our case modern scholarly comparison has depended not merely on the sheer piling-up of relevant data but important, often problematic scholarly assumptions. As we shall see, the range and type of sources applied to the question varied widely and sometimes in fact narrowed over the twentieth century, even as the available data rapidly grew. Thus one can contrast Kvanvig's view with a complementary, if polemical, statement about how research in religion really works, articulated by the historian of religion Bruce Lincoln. Lincoln notes that in Indo-European studies:

> scholars actively construct that which they study through their selection of evidence, a process in which they systematically disarticulate certain data from their original context while ignoring others, and rearticulate those so chosen within a novel context of their own devising. These novel contexts, moreover, are inevitably, if most often unconsciously, conditioned by the interests of their authors (taking "interests" in its bland, as well as its more pointed meaning), for even discourse about the past and the exotic enters the present always and only for reasons of the here and now.[17]

The relevance of Lincoln's comment to the history of Enoch research is suggested by three facts: one is that the first and most influential study, Heinrich Zimmern's analysis of a single anomalous cuneiform text, has remained essentially unmodified since its 1903 debut.[18] Zimmern compared the figure of Enoch with

[17] "Kings, Rebels, and the Left Hand" in Lincoln 1991:244–58. The example Lincoln chose for his study was George Dumézil's insistence that the Roman myths of Cocles and Scaevola "ought be compared first and foremost to those of Odinn and Tyr" rather than other formally similar myths inside or outside Indo-European. This enabled Dumézil not only "to posit a single (Indo-European) prototype for them, but to argue that the significance of this prototype was its schematic presentation of ideal sovereignty as something both magical and legal alike." This is a specific and pointed view of the myths' politics, and not the only one that can be legitimately constructed from the available materials, as Lincoln proves.

[18] There had already been several alternative comparisons made between Enoch and the figure of Utnapishtim, a Mesopotamian flood-hero like Noah – both were uniquely intimate with their gods who then swept them away to an inaccessible place where they would not die. But neither Zimmern (1902:551–56) nor Gunkel (1997:134–35) accepted this parallel. And after VanderKam's arguments for the Enmeduranki text as the single most crucial piece of evidence, virtually all subsequent scholars (see footnote below for a list of examples) treat the connection as obvious.

the Mesopotamian king Enmeduranki on the basis of a reconstructed common tradition of the revelation of astronomical and divinatory techniques to a pious hero who stands seventh in an antediluvian line. While recent Assyriological work has added philological data to Zimmern's Mesopotamian text, comparative study has still made little attempt to place it in history.

No one, for example, seems to have asked whether there is evidence as to which figures Mesopotamian scholars *actually* emulated, or whether or not the figure of Enmeduranki was important to Babylonian or Judean scholars during the period that the Enoch material developed. This is despite the fact that we now know far more about what Babylonian scholars knew, and the changes their culture underwent in the Neo-Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic periods. Comparison has been complexly historical on the Jewish side of the comparison while remaining largely ahistorical on the Mesopotamian.

The second fact is that over the twentieth century scholars have agreed that the figure of Enoch is a Jewish adaption of foreign elements[19] but have been unable to agree on what those elements are. Each new attempt has brought a different range of material. The cumulative corpus has thereby become vast.[20] The third fact is that while scholars have sometimes continued to consider the same data to be relevant, resisting potential complexities that new materials might have introduced, they have also *avoided* previously introduced data with little explanation or justification. The history of research is stratified, with some older layers becoming buried, while others are repeatedly re-excavated and frequently exposed.[21]

Since antiquity, scholars have speculated about the unusual statements in Genesis 5:18–24 on the antediluvian patriarch Enoch's life and death:

When Jared had lived 162 years, he begot Enoch. After the birth of Enoch, Jared lived 800 years and begot sons and daughters. All the days of Jared came to 962 years; then he

---

[19] This is based, perhaps, on a biblically defined set of assumptions about what "native" Jewish material could or could not be. While he allows for borrowings (Stone 1984), Stone has voiced an important critique of these assumptions: "In principle, there is no reason to think that the body of literature that is transmitted as the Hebrew Bible is a representative collection of all types of Jewish literary creativity down to the fourth century . . . It is specious . . . when faced by a third-century phenomenon, to have to choose between seeking its roots in the Bible or relegating it to foreign influence" (Stone 1978:490–91).

[20] It ranges from medieval Mandaic and Pahlavi compilations through hellenistic and classical Greek sources contemporary with the books of Enoch to ancient Sumerian and Akkadian texts that precede it by up to two millennia.

[21] To use a different image, a chart of this history of research from its apex of breadth with the studies of Jansen in 1939 and Widengren in 1950 which included, among others, a wide range of Iranian and Hellenistic materials would show that, while the cumulative range of materials used has increased, the range of materials actually used in each survey has *contracted* over time. It is hard to explain this as merely the accumulation of relevant data. For a demonstration of the continuing relevance and challenge of the Mandaic material, which has incorporated many Mesopotamian elements into a new cosmology, see Deutsch 1995, 1999.

died. When Enoch had lived 65 years, he begot Methuselah. After the birth of Methuselah, Enoch walked with God 300 years; and he begot sons and daughters. All the days of Enoch came to 365 years. Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, for God took him.

Enoch's father Jared's life displays the repetitive standard formula for patriarchs in the Priestly genealogies of Genesis. He is said to do three and only three things: live 962 years, beget children, and die. By comparison, Enoch stands out in several ways. He "walked with God" (like only Noah), he lived an unusually short life of 365 years (the other patriarchs in this list live between seven and nine centuries), and, unlike any other character in Genesis, he is not said to die but is simply taken away by God.

By the second century BCE, the Hebrew apocalyptic work Jubilees shows that numerous other traditions were known about Enoch. He is said to be the first writer, the first astronomer, and an apocalyptic seer who preserved his predictions in a written testimony (Jub. 4:17–19). He is said to have learned this astronomy firsthand, on a heavenly journey in which he was with the angels of God who "showed him everything which is on earth and in the heavens, the rule of the sun, and he wrote down everything. And he testified to the Watchers, who had sinned with the daughters of men" (4:21–22).

Where did these traditions come from? Zimmern's answer was that Enoch's origins can be found in an obscure Mesopotamian king, Enmeduranki. Although he had become an obscure figure by the Persian and Hellenistic periods, appearing very rarely in cuneiform documents of those eras, his image still dominates modern scholarly surveys of the question. This phenomenon in the history of scholarship is perhaps even more interesting than the suggestive parallels between an Israelite patriarch and this mythical Mesopotamian king. Cited as established fact in general introductions as well as specialized studies, this Mesopotamian "background" became effectively canonical in explaining the history of the Judean scribal hero.[22]

It is valuable to examine how our history of ancient scribes' myths come to be dominated by decontextualized parallels – rather than broader studies of historical contacts or literary contexts – because the method of parallel-seeking has had consequences for the study of Judea and Mesopotamia. The context of the first and most influential study of Enoch's Mesopotamian background is in a series of intense disputes, now mostly forgotten, which were nonetheless to prove formative in the relationship between Assyriology, Biblical Studies, and the comparative study of religion.[23] In the scholarly climate of the 1900s, the

---

[22] See e.g. Orlov 2005:23–39 (a discussion nearly identical to 2009a), 2007:178–79, 190, 324–25, 2009a, Arbel 2003:98, Fröhlich 2012, Kvanvig 1988, 2007:142, 148, A. Collins 2012: 557, J.J. Collins 1997b:44–48, 341–43, 1998:44–47, Fletcher-Louis 2008:138.

[23] Hermann Gunkel concluded his devastating review of Jensen's *Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur* with a comment worth quoting at length, both because of its self-consciousness about disciplinary boundaries and because when Pan-Babylonianist tendencies reemerged (e.g.

explanatory power of ancient Near Eastern documents was tested in a series of controversies: the *Babel-Bibel-Streit*, the Pan-Babylonian controversy, and the Gilgamesh controversy, of which the third is the most striking example. Starting in 1906, a fierce debate around the influence of the figure of Gilgamesh on world mythology occurred around the work of Peter Jensen. Jensen was a highly accomplished Assyriologist whose edition of Gilgamesh was praised by no less demanding a critic than Benno Landsberger. In 1906 Jensen produced a massive monograph, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur. Erster Band: Die Ursprünge der alttestamentlichen Patriarchen-, Propheten- und Befreier-Sage und der neutestamentlichen Jesus-Sage.*

The title's claims seem ludicrous today.[24] But Jensen's work was based on an assumption that is still influential in the study of biblical and early Jewish literature: similarity between narratives is evidence of the *historical derivation* of one from the other, regardless of specific historical context.[25] Jensen's principle that systematic parallels are to be understood first as evidence for a genetic

---

Parpola 1993b, Annus 2001), they were to show many of the features against which Gunkel railed:

"Was haben wir alles erlebt! Den jetzt friedlich entschlafenen Bibel-Babel-Streit, den demnächst – man darf die Weissagung wagen – zusammenbrechenden 'Panbabylonismus', zuletzt – Gilgamesch. Jedesmal gingen diese Bewegungen von Männern aus, deren Verdienste als *Assyriologen* wir verehren; auch von Jensen sei das, obwohl es überflüssig ist, dies Selbstverständliche auszusprechen, ausdrücklich festgestellt. Aber, so müssen wir denn doch fragen, woher kommt es denn eigentlich, daß diese Dinge immer gerade von Assyriologen in die Welt gesetzt wurden? Woher kommt es, daß der grundstürzende Fehler immer dieser war, daß ihre Vertreter sich nicht genügend auf dem fremden Gebiet, das sie beraten, vertraut gemacht hatten und wohl auch nicht vertraut machen konnten? Andere Forscher sehen auch gelegentlich über die Grenzen ihres Gebietes herüber, aber um sich dort Belehrung zu *holen*, nicht um die Fachgelehrten zu *belehren*. Und warum mußten sich diese Männer gleich an ein größeres Publikum wenden? Möchten die Assyriologen doch wieder werden, was sie einst gewesen und einige noch jetzt sind, unsere höchst willkommenen *Berater* bei *unsern* Problemen!" (*DLZ* 30 [1909]:901–11, reprinted in Oberhuber 1977.

[24] The discomfort that this idea, that Gilgamesh is the source of Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, induces today is deserved, but it distracts us from the extent to which his work was a part of a movement that helped shape the study of Bible and Judaism in an ancient Near Eastern context. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the Pan-Babylonian school established by Winckler, Delitzsch, and Jeremias argued that Israelite culture was essentially an offshoot of a unified ancient Near Eastern cultural system, Babylonian at root. For an example of its influence on New Testament studies see this early critical description by an American scholar: "Other investigators draw more largely upon the religions of the ancient Orient for data to explain the rise of Christianity . . . While the representatives of the *religionsgeschichtliche* school are usually content with maintaining that the gospel accounts of Jesus are more or less heightened by the introduction of foreign elements, many of its conclusions can readily be made to serve the interests of those who argue against Jesus' historicity" (Case 1912:42–43).

[25] To be fair, Jensen also argued for systematic comparison of texts with relation to a phenomenological type, a rich idea still central to comparative religion. In the beginning of the book Jensen articulated a coherent set of principles for the disciplined comparison of different myths: isolated parallels were to be discounted in favor of systematic comparisons of narratives. Comparison of any two objects was to be conducted with reference to a third term, a

relationship was typical of his time, but it has continued to dominate the history of traditions approach to using cuneiform materials.[26]

Zimmern's theory of Enoch's Mesopotamian origins was important for both its methods and its specific claims because it was part of the first important movement to demonstrate how ancient Near Eastern documents could illuminate the Hebrew Bible. It was proposed three years before the appearance of Jensen's book, in the third edition of *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament,*[27] a product of the first generation to use Assyriology as a sort of handmaid to Bible criticism.[28] Both this technique and its problems are brilliantly demonstrated in Zimmern's essay on "Urkönige und Offenbarung" (1903), the first and most influential study of the Mesopotamian background of Enoch.

To explain why Enoch, the Priestly source's seventh antediluvian patriarch, became a companion of divine beings, a prophet and the first astronomer, Zimmern drew on a Mesopotamian list of kings in which a king named Enmeduranki was the seventh antediluvian ruler. The list was then only known at third- or fourth-hand in Christian excerpts from a Greek summary of Mesopotamian culture written by a third-century BCE Babylonian priest named Berossos. Then,

phenomenological type. These principles are not only unobjectionable but considered a model for comparison by methodologists in the history of religions (J.Z. Smith 1978).

[26] It is also important in the study of biblical law, where David Wright's important recent work on the Covenant Code, the oldest biblical law collection (2009, analyzed in chapter 5 below), argues that it is systematically derived from and responds to the older Mesopotamian laws of Hammurapi.

[27] This edition represented a thoroughgoing revision of a work by the liberal protestant Biblicist and Assyriologist Eberhard Schrader (1836–1908) at the hands of two more Assyriologists: Hugo Winckler (1863–1913), and Heinrich Zimmern (1862–1931). Winckler, the first editor of the El-Amarna tablets, was responsible for *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Ägypter* (1903), and a *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament* (1889); more infamously, he was considered the founder of the Pan-Babylonian school. Zimmern contributed a work on *Die Assyriologie als Hülfswissenschaft für das Studium des alten Testaments und des klassischen Altertums* (1889) but also vigorously defended Jensen from the scathing attacks of Zimmern's friend Hermann Gunkel. Both Winckler and Zimmern produced studies in comparative mythology; just as significantly, they also worked to construct the sorts of comparisons which, by the first decade of the twentieth century, had extended to the New Testament to give us such works as *The Legend of Jesus the Sun-God* (*Die Sage von Jesus dem Sonnengott*, 1911). *Pagan Christs: Studies in Comparative Hierology* (1911) as well as Jensen's own *Moses, Jesus, Paul: Three Variants of the Babylonian Divine-Man Gilgamesh* (*Moses, Jesus, Paulus: Drei Varianten des babylonischen Gottmenschen Gilgamesch: Eine Anklage wider die Theologen, Ein Appell auch an die Laien*) (Jensen 1909; note the anti-theological polemic in the subtitle). These three titles are mentioned in J.Z. Smith 1990:87–88.

[28] For examples of the comparative studies of Winckler and Zimmern see *Arabisch-semitisch-orientalisch: Kulturgeschichtlich-mythologische Untersuchung* (1901) and "Lebensbrot und Lebenswasser im Babylonischen und in der Bibel" (1899) respectively; for examples of their work at controlling the comparisons of others, *Der alte Orient und die Bibel* (1906, on the *Babel-Bibel-Streit*) and *Keilinschriften und Bibel nach ihrem religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang: ein Leitfaden zur Orientierung im sog. Babel-Bibel-Streit: mit Einbeziehung auch der neutestamentlichen Probleme* (1903), respectively.